Previous references.
alteration Govt. Note
31-2/J981 D/26.3.95

1909.

File No. 49 of 08

Serial Nos. 1, 1a; 2 D

(Prisons)

Later references.
vis 56 No 8 - Sls 142
~~Sls 85~~
No 21-09 - 1 to 3

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1, 1a, 2 D 3

Part B. for April '09

SUBJECT.

Complaint of one Kempiah, Patel of Bheemen Village against the Lock-up Officer of Maindy wrong detention and for refusing to attest his alatneema

---

Table of Contents.

From The I.G. of Prisons No 139 D/26.1.09
forwards the records connected with the above for such action as the Govt. may deem fit to take.

From the same No 171 D/5.2.09
forwards some additional records.

To The I.G. of Prisons The I.G. of Registration and the Comptroller, Accts of ~~Prisons~~ Nos J 2962-5 D/6.4.09
Passes orders on the above

To The I.G. of Prisons No 2966 D/ 6.4.09
G. R. S. 58 Requests him to send the proposals for amending Rule 25 of the lock-up rules and enquires what procedure is adopted in regard to the attestation for transmitting

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Prisons)

NOTES.

File No. 49-0

FILE HEADING.

Complaint of one Kempiah, Patel of Bhimanakere village against the Police-up Officer of Mandya for wrong-detention & for refusing to attest his vakalatnama.

From

The Inspector-General of Prisons.

No. 139 Dated 26-1-05 Received 27-1-05

Diary No. 1606 Enclos. 1 File Spare Copies — Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Forwards the whole records connected with the above case of one Kempiah for such action as Government may be pleased to take.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Submitted —

1 Patel Kempiah and four others were tried for theft by the Sub-Division 1st Class Magistrate of French Rocks. who sentenced the Patel Kempiah to three months' rigorous

Flag V.

GPB—30,000—3-1-07.

Serial No.

imprisonment and pay a fine of Rs 100 and the other accused to suffer one month's rigorous imprisonment & pay a fine of Rs 20 etc - the convicted persons preferred an appeal and the Sessions Judge set aside the conviction and sentence on the appellants, stating "That the alleged midnight raid is a concoction and that Nidagatta Annegowda has set up the son-in-law of the complainant Kempa and dominated this false prosecution.

Flag Y

Flag Z

2 The principal complaint of Kempa is against the Lockup Officer of Mandya who is said to have detained the said Kempaiah for three days after the 1st sentence of conviction was passed on him by the Asst Commissioner Magistrate of French Rocks Sub-Division on the 7th July 08, instead of despatching him at once to the Mysore jail and for refusing to attest the Vakalatnama of the petitioner, as the Lockup Rules, which require a Lockup Officer to despatch prisoners sentenced to undergo imprisonment for more than a month, to the Mysore jail & to attest Vakalatnamas -

3 The District Magistrate

Serial No.

is of opinion that the conduct of the Sub-Registrar Lockup Officer is unjustifiable, but exonerates him as no sinister motive can be attributed to him. The Sessions Judge in his Judgment takes exception to the conduct of the Lockup Officer for refusing to attest a vakalatnama presented by the Complainant advocate. The Lock-up Officer in his explanation states that he had some doubts as to the meaning of the rules as regards the attestation of such documents & this is corroborated by the statement of the Tahsildar whom the Lock-up Officer is said to have consulted. As regards the wrong detention of Kempiah, the Lock up Officer says that the Judgment was delivered on the 7th and the warrants of imprisonment were received on the 8th and that on the same day, the railway fare & warrant were sent to the Police Station for despatching the petitioners to the Mysore Jail. But the warrants were acknowledged to have been

GPB—50.000—18-5-08

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Pris File No. 45 of 1908-09.

Serial No.	
	received by the Lockup Officer Mr. Bhattaparti Rao in the 7th Dist. statement X gives the summary of the Subst for orders CRW 1.2.09 4.2.09
	The Inspector General of Prisons No: 171 Ds 5-2-09 Forwards some further records in the case of Patel Kempiah complaining against the Lockup Officer and Sub-Regr of Mandya. Submitted to Asst Secretary in Continuation of diary no: 9.1806 (Pris F.no: 45-08-09). CRW 8.2.09

7 Dist
P 07-72
7 Dist X

Serial No.

Some further records have now been received from the D.G. of Prisons.
8.2.09.

This is a reference by the D. G. of Prisons. The facts are as stated above: I shall take up each charge separately, premising that the Lockup officer concerned is the Sub Registrar of Mandya Taluq.

(1) The first charge by petitioner Kanjan against the Lock-up officer is that he was detained unduly long at Mandya though having been sentenced for more than one month's imprisonment he had to be sent at once to the Mysore Jail.

The petitioner was convicted on the 7th July 1908 and he was sent to Mysore on the 9th July by the mail train. The delay is explained by the L. U. officer

Serial No.

to be due to the warrants having been received late by him. He says that though the prisoners were admitted to lock-up on the Evening of the 7th July, he received the warrants only on the 8th morning. This however is not so, as the Yadi under cover of which the warrants were sent bears the Sub Registrar's initials and date as 7th July 08. The Deputy Commissioner surmises that the S. R. Officer's memory has misled him. Possibly it is so.

11 Anyhow this much must be said on the part of the Sub Registrar that he had no right to admit the prisoners in the Lockup on the Evening of the 7th, if indeed the warrants did not accompany the prisoners.

12 The Sub Registrar further explains that he gave the railway fare to the Police on the 8th alone and that consequently he was not responsible for the delay in sending the prisoners to Mysore. This is possibly a true Explanation and as such is accepted as correct by the Officer who held the inquiry (the Sub Div. Officer

Flag W page 72
& Flag W
p. 68-72

See letter in this file & in the file in his office-hand-entry

Serial No.

of French Rocks. It must however be remarked that it was the Lockup officer's duty to see that the Police promptly obeyed his orders. This order must have been at least two hours before the trial of the 9th

13(2). The second charge is that the petitioner was made to don prison clothing previously worn by Pariah. The Lockup officer explains that he asked his clerk to provide the petitioner with clothing and that he did not see whether the dress worn by a Holeya was given to the petitioner.

14 Very likely the explanation is true but the fact remains that the prisoner was made to don prison clothing though it was by no means obligatory to do so. The District Magistrate while remarking on this point observes that the Lockup officer was bound to see the prisoner don the prison clothes under the rules.

15. This, I submit, is based on a misapprehension of the rules on the point. Rule 10A of the rules

Serial No.

applicable to lockups lays down that "all prisoners, without reference to the nature of the punishment awarded to them may be allowed to wear their own clothing, provided it is good and clean". This; it may be remarked is an amendment of the old rules which required that every prisoner uniformly imprisoned should wear prison clothing. Probably the District Magistrate's attention was not drawn to the amended rule. But I fancy the Sub Registrar who is immediately in charge of the Lockup was aware of it or if he was not it only argues that he had not taken the trouble to acquaint himself with the most elementary principle of Lockup management.

(3) The next point for consideration is the Sub Registrar's explanation for not attesting the Vakalat of the petitioner. The Sub Registrar admits that he was asked to attest it but that he did not do so because he thought the presence of the lawyer, in whose favour the Vakala

Serial No.

was given was necessary. He explains that whether right or wrong in his understanding of rule 25, he honestly believed that he could not have the Vakalat attested except in the presence of the lawyer and that he had no dishonourable or unworthy motive in acting as he did.

Statement Flag X

17 Upon this explanation the District Magistrate remarks that the omission of the Sub Registrar to have the Vakalat attested is inexcusable as being a graduate in law, he should at least have known so much. He however thinks that it was the Sub Registrar's stupidity or indiscretion that led him to act as he did.

Flag U page 59 para 24

18 This no doubt true that the Sub Registrar consulted the Amlah who, I believe, is also a graduate in law, and who also, strangely enough, confirmed him in his wrong impression. But even assuming that the Sub Registrar's interpretation of the words "will have it duly attest

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—13.

Serial No.

is Correct, he could at least have obtained the attestation of Some one or other to the Signature of the prisoner. There is no justification for his thinking that the presence of the lawyer himself was necessary.

9 This is an Every day practice in Every jail and Lockup for the officer in charge to attest the Vakalats Signed by the prisoners in custody and it is Surprising that the SubRegistrar pleads ignorance of this rule.

10 The Dy. of prisons reasonably observes that the Conduct of the SubRegistrar led to the unnecessary detention of the petitioner in custody for a longer period than was necessary, as it ultimately turned out that he was let on bail and Subsequently acquitted altogether.

11 The District Magistrate while remarking Strongly on the Conduct of the SubRegistrar in regard to this point Exonerates him from all blame - Except for a Severe reprimand - on the Ground that he was not actuated by any "Sinister motives". But the

Submitted

If trial or dismissal are to be passed in this Case, holding that the Sub Registrar is deserves Some punishment, the file will have to go - probably to the ~~Secretary~~ 1st Councillor.

I do not think this is a Case in which the Inspector General of Registration need be consulted, at all Events at this Stage. In another Case a Sub Registrar's Clerk was punished on the recommendation of the Dy. Commrs (Escape of a prisoner from Kappa Lockup)

In this Case, the Conduct under inquiry is purely of the Lockup Police

11.7.09. SH.

G. S. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Pris File No. 45 of 1908-09

Serial No.

Ly. Offrisons Considers that the Conduct of the Sub Registrar deserves far more Serious notice, as the "overdetention of a Subject of his His Highness is, in his opinion an act that ought not to be Excuse or ~~Condoned~~ Condoned by a mere warning of the offender."

2nd I think the ends of official discipline would be Satisfied if the Sub Registrar is made to lose three places. He is now second in the list of those getting Rs 50/-. The punishment would be severe enough as promotions among Sub Registrars are fast and far between.

10.2.09. Sd/—
2nd Councillor)

L3 The prisoner was admitted into Lockup on the evening of 7th and should have been despatched to Mysore on the 8th by the mail train. This was not done. He was made to wear prison clothing previously worn by a

Serial No.

Pariah servant of his and made to work as a Convict in the Streets of Mandya - a proceeding which must have given great satisfaction to his enemies.

29 The Lock up Officer refused to attest the Vakalathnama thereby delaying the order for his release on bail - The above are admitted facts and argue serious dereliction of duty on the part of the Lockup Officer (Subregistrar Chakrapani Rao) It is hard to believe that he was actuated by sinister motives, but it is quite possible that by his careless proceeding he played into the hands of the enemies of the Petr who rejoiced in his discomfiture and humiliation in public I cannot easily believe that the Lockup Officer demand

Serial No.

a bribe for attesting the Vakalatnama.

27 A severe reprimand and stoppage of promotion for say one year will I think meet the ends of discipline.

26 If the 1st Councillor agrees, orders may issue

Illegible
11/2/09

11.2.09. Sd.
Submitted to 1st Councillor.

11.2.09. Sd.

27 I agree with the 2d Councillor

28 2. Two or three points require atte

29 3. In the draft Magh of the lock up Ru are obligations of the amended Rule 60 of the lock up rules – This point to the unpressing necessity for a revision of the Jail manual at an early date – The present Edition is 15 years old & much cut up with additions & alterations –

30 4. Rule 25 is liable the misunder

stood

Serial No.

- Stood (in the way it has been in this case) by the Sub Deputies in consequence of this reference being limited to powers of attorney attested by Magistrates (free of charge) or by Sub Deputies (on payment of a fee) - Vide Rules amendment. If an Advocate is usually (as indeed he ought to be) allowed to appear for an accused without the formality of presenting a vakalat namah I do not see why one should be attested at all, unless the accused is illiterate & cannot sign his name -

31 5. It is not clear why the warrant for the execution of the Sentence on Kempiah, directed to the Officer in charge of the Mysore Jail and apparently enclosed in a cover addressed to him, should have been sent with a Peadon to the Lock up Officer for despatch with Prisoner to Mysore - The Committing Magistrate could well have sent it to the local Police Officer whose duty it would be in any case to provide

Serial No.

provide the necessary escort
& arrange for the transit - &
the present case the lock up off.
had to request the Police & do
what the magte. might himself
have required them to do; -

326. But the most serious matter
is the execution of the sentence
on Kempiah at Mandya -
The warrant for execution of
sentence was addressed (as
already stated) to the Mysore
Jail Offcr. The prisoner Kemp
reaching the lock up at night fall
on the 7th July, was transferred by the
lock up Offcr (on the 8th) to the Police Subdl
& Mysore. The prisoner seems to
have been made to work at Mandya
on the 8th. Official witnesses say
that he worked in the Compound of
the Taluk Cutcherry - Non-Official
witnesses say that he was made
to work in the streets of the Town
As these witnesses are apparently
trustworthy the truth probably is
that Kempiah was made to
work in both places - At any
late

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—13-5-08

Serial No.

take he was made to work in the cutcherry compound. Was the execution by Mamlya authority of a warrant addressed to Myp Jail Mein Upilar? If not, it is the most serious irregularity in the case which calls for notice —

Sd/ 27/2/09

33 Re-Submitted to 2nd Commissr.

(1) I think the order can issue now.

Draft proceedings will be put up.

(2) Shall I request the Hy. Sessions to take up the revision after Jail mamlas on hand at once?

(3) As regards Rule 25 of the Lockup rules, I think it may be amended so as to make it clearer, by consulting the Chief Court if necessary.

If permitted, these matters will be incorporated into the proceedings to issue in this case

23.2.09. Sd/-

23.2.09.

Draft Submitted.

CRW

27.2.09.

GPO—50,000—13-5-08

Pris. File No. 45 of 1908-09.

Serial No. 38

Re submitted with a draft order - Office begs to invite the attention of the Asst: Secretary to Rule 32 of the Loc rule as regards the query of the 1st Councillor para 6, pages-14+15 Office Perhaps this rule authorised the Lock Officer to make the Complainant wor while he was in Mandya Lock-up.

39 As regards the order of the 2nd Councillor ~~that~~ to stop the promotion of the Lock-up Officer for one year, Office begs to state that according to the present scale, there is no chance of Mr. Chakrapani Rao being promo within a year - promotions being guided by Seniority. ~~As~~ he now gets the maximum pay of the grade, it is not likely that ~~the~~ sub-Registrar Mr Chakrapany Rao will have any chance of getting a higher pay or grade within one year.

CRD
3.3.09
20/3/09

Submitted with a fair draft order & draft of a letter to the D. G. of Prisons.
CRD
20.3.09.

Serial No. 44

Fair drafts submitted.

CRW

26.3.09

29/3

44 (1) Draft Go. pntup disposes of the case on the merits, as ordered, and contains also request to the Dy. Commrs to take up the revision of the Jail manual on hand.

(2) As regards amendment of rule 25 and the procedure adopted for transmitting of Convicts sentenced to more than one month's imprisonment in the Mofussil to Bangalore and Mysore Jails, a separate docket to the Dy. Commrs is drafted and pntup.

(Both these points were raised by the 2nd Councillor)

45 The drafts may be approved

29/3/09

2nd Councillor).

44 Approved

29/3/09

29/3/09

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50.000—13-5-08

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Pris File No. 48 of 1908

Serial No.	
2	To The I. G. of Prisons, The I. G. of Registration and Comptroller and the ~~Dy~~ Dt. Magistrate of ~~Dist~~ Imposn No 2962-5/Pris 48-08-2 Dt 6.6.08 Passes orders on the petition of Kamlesh
3	To The I. G. of Prisons No 2966 Dt 6.6.08 Requests him to send up proposal for amending Rule 25 of the Lock-up rules and enquires what procedure is adopted by Magistrates in the Mofussil for Prisoners awaiting committal to the Jails at Bombay & Impose

No. 139 Enc: 1 file.
F. 56-08

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF PRISONS IN MYSORE.

Dated Bangalore, 26th January 1909.

FROM

Lt.-Colonel J.Smyth M.D., I.M.S.,

Inspector-General of Prisons in Mysore, Bangalore.

To

K.S.Chandrasekhara Aiyar Esqr., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore, General & Revenue Departments.

SIR,

I have the honor to bring to the notice of Government that one Kempiah, Patel of Bhimankere village, Mandya Taluk, Mysore District, complained to me in writing (1) that he was, after criminal conviction, unnecessarily detained in the local Lock-up instead of being immediately transferred to the District Jail, (2) that he was given to don prison clothing previously worn by a Pariah prisoner and (3) that the Lock-up Officer declined to have a vakalatnama sent by his (complainant's) counsel signed by the prisoner and attested by him.

2. The complaints were referred to the District Magistrate of Mysore and directed by him the Sub-Divisional Magistrate of French Rocks held detailed enquiry into the matter and forwarded the records connected with it to him (the District Magistrate). The latter officer, after perusal of the records, holds that the Lock-up Officer's conduct was unjustifiable but yet exonerates him under all the charges as no sinister motive is attributable to him.

3. The records show that the refusal on the part of the Lock-up Officer to get a simple 'vakalatnama' signed by the prisoner

III 427.1.7 1908

From

The Inspector-General of Prisons
in Mysore:

To

The Secy. to the Govt. of H. H.
the Mahārāja of Mysore,
Gen. & Rev. Departments.

No. 139
F. 56-08 Enc: 1-file.

Dated 26th January 1909.

Subject.

rewards certain / correspondence
such action as Govt may
; with regard to the action
the Lock-up officer in
attesting the vakalathnama
&c.

and attested by himself prevented the appeal being preferred soon after conviction whereby the complainant whose conviction was ultimately held to be erroneous remained in custody longer than otherwise. This over-detention or wrong-detention of one of His Highness' subjects in prison is, I think, a very serious matter and not one to be excused or condoned by a mere warning of the offender. I therefore forward herewith the whole correspondence on the subject for such action as Government may be pleased to take with regard to the action of the Lock-up Officer in not attesting the vakalatnama.

4. The enclosures may be returned when no longer required.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

M.D.,

Lt.-Colonel I.M.S.,

Inspector General of Prisons

9 1555

No. 171
F. 56-08 Encs:2.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF PRISONS IN MYSORE.

Fe. No: 45-08-09

Dated Bangalore, 4th February 1909.

S. No: 1(a)

FROM

Lieut.-Colonel J.Smyth M.D., I.M.S.,

Inspector-General of Prisons in Mysore,
Bangalore.

To

K.S.Chandrasekhara Aiyer, Esqr., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
General & Revenue Departments.

SIR,

In continuation of my letter No. 139/56-08 dated the 26th ultimo re- complaints preferred by one Kempiah against the Lock-up Officer of Mandya, I have the honor to forward herewith

1. No. 389 dated 22-10-08 from the 1st class magistrate, French Rocks; to the District -- Magistrate, Mysore.
2. " 2139 dated 14-11-08 from the District Magistrate, Mysore, to the 1st class Magistrate of French Rocks..

two more papers as noted in the margin on the same subject since received from the District Magistrate of Mysore.

2. One of them is the Report from the 1st class magistrate of French Rocks to the District Magistrate of Mysore on conclusion of the enquiries held in the matter. As this Report was neither conclusive nor exhaustive, the District Magistrate has asked the former officer in the other paper to verify, by examining other independent witnesses, the Lock-up Officer's explanation and intimate in definite and clear terms, his finding on each of the charges preferred by the complainant.

3. The papers in continuation of the latter have already been sent to you with the letter under reference. I request that the two papers now sent may be kindly caused to be included and re-

W 4 61 ✓ Nov 61 ✓ 1999

From

The Inspector-General of Prisons
in Mysore.

To

The Secy. to the Govt. of H. H.
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Gen. & Rev. Departments.

No. 171 / F. 56-08 Encs: 2.

Dated 4/5 Feby. 1907.

Subject.

Forwards in original two more papers since received from the Distt Magte of Mysore re: complaints preferred by one Kempiah against the Lock-up Office Srandya.

-turned to me along with them.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,



For Inspector General of Prisons

Two drafts
Rare draft

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read:-

Letter No.139/F.56-08 dated the 26th January 1909 from the Inspector General of Prisons in Mysore, bringing to notice of Government certain complaint one Kempiah against the Lock-up Office (Sub Registrar M. Chakrapani Rao) of Mandya Taluk Lock-Up, Mysore District.

2. Letter No.171 dated the 5th February 1909 from the same officer forwarding some additional records in the mat

Order thereon No. 12962-5 / Pris.49-08-2

Dated Bangalore, 6th ~~March~~ April 1909.

One Kempiah and four others were convicted at Mandya by the Assistant Commissioner and 1st Class Magistrate of French Rocks on the 7th July 1908 under Section 380 Indian Penal Code and were sentenced to rigorous imprisonment for three months and one month respectively. They

were admitted into the Mandya Lock-up on the evening of the same day but as the sentence passed on Kempiah was for more than one month, he was transferred to the Mysore Jail by the Mail-Train of the 9th idem. During this short interval Kempiah is alleged to have been subjected to several indignities by the Lock-Up Officer of Mandya (Sub Registrar M.Chakrapani Rao) made the subject of a Complaint These he ~~subsequently embodied~~ in a petition ~~of complaint~~ addressed by him to the Inspector General of Prisons in Mysore. Kempiah stated in his petition(1) that he was, after conviction, unnecessarily detained in the Mandya Lock-Up instead of being immediately transferred to the District Jail at Mysore,(2) that he was made to put on prison clothing and (3) that the Lock-up officer declined to attest a vakalat-nama presented by the complainant's friends for his signature.

The Inspector General of Prisons requested ~~directed~~ the District Magistrate of Mysore to hold an enquiry into the allegations

made by Kempiah. The latter officer in forwarding the records of enquiry to the Inspector General of Prisons, observed that the conduct of the Lock-up officer was otherwise open to censure, but exonerated him on the ground that he was not actuated by any sinister motives. The Inspector General on the other hand considers that the conduct of the Lock Up Officer which resulted in the over- detention ~~or wrong detention~~ of one of His Highness' subjects in prison is not one to be excused or condoned by a mere warning of the offender. He has therefore submitted the records for the orders of Government.

Government observe that petitioner Kempiah was detained in Mandya till the 9th of July, though he was admitted into the local Lock up on the 7th idem. He was also made to don prison clothing during his detention there, though under rule 10a of the Lockup rules it was not quite obligatory ~~to have done so on the part of the Lock Up officer.~~ Government are willing to believe that the

Lock Up Officer was not actuated by any sinister motives but it can not be gain-said that by his carelessness he played himself into the hands of Kempaiah's enemies, whose sole object seems to have to disgrace him in the town of Mandya.

It is in regard to the third of the above charges that the Lock-Up officer's conduct appears to be most reprehensible. It is admitted by him that soon after the conviction, Kempiah's friends requested him to attest the execution of a Vakalat by Kempiah in favour of his lawyer at Mysore with a view to prefer an appeal.

This the Lock-Up Officer declined to do and insisted on the lawyer appearing in person and he persisted in his refusal though written to by the lawyer himself from Mysore. The result was that Kempiah had to remain much longer in Jail than would have been necessary, as it transpired that he was subsequently released on bail and eventually acquitted on appeal by the

the Sessions Court.

The explanation furnished by the Lock Up Officer is that he understood Rule 28 of the Lock Up rules to mean that the presence of the lawyer, in whose favour the Vakalat was to be executed, was necessary. Government are surprised that the Lock Up Officer who is a graduate in law should have betrayed such ignorance of one of the commonest rules observed in all Jails and Lock-Ups. There is absolutely nothing in the rule to justify his supposition that the presence of the lawyer was necessary for having the execution of the Vakalat attested. This action of the Lock-up Officer, resulted, as remarked above, in the unnecessary detention of Kempiah in prison and Government cannot lightly pass over the conduct of an officer, whose infraction of well recognised rules has resulted in such serious consequences. They are, therefore, pleased to direct that their severe censure be conveyed to ~~the~~

him and that his promotion in the grade of Sub-Registrars be stopped for one year from the date of this order.

The irregularities brought to light in this record point to the imperative necessity for the re-issue of the Jail Manual at an early date. The present edition is 15 years old and is much cut up by additions and alterations. The Inspector General of Prisons is requested to take the work on hand at once and submit the draft of a complete Manual for the consideration of Government.

for Secretary to Govt.

CRD
26-3-09

To

The Inspector General of Prisons in Mysore.
returning records.
of Registration in Mysore.
Comptroller, Mysore Government.

M.L.

G.R.S. 26]

File No. 69
Serial No. 3

Diary No. of letter replied to——

No. J 2966
Pris 49-08-3

General and Revenue Secretariat

190 .

Date of issue 6.4.09.

Signed by Asst Secretary

To

The Inspector General of Prisons in Mysore

Sir

In Continuation of G.O. Proceedings no: J 2962-5 Pris 49-08-2 & 6th April 09 I am directed to inform you that Rule 18 of the Lock-up rule, is liable to be misunderstood as it has been by the Lock-up Officer of Mandya. I am to request you to send up a suitable amendment of the said rule for the consideration of Government, after consultation with

the Chief Court
necessary.

2) ~~I am also to~~
~~point out that it will~~ Style
It is
be observed from the
records of the case referred to
in the above G.O. that the
warrant of Committment
of Kempaiya to the Mysore
Gaol was despatched to
the Lock-up officer of
Mandya for further action.
In this connection, Govt would
be glad to know the procedure
adopted by Magistrates in the Moffusil at the for
~~for~~ transmitting convicts sentenced
by them to more than one month's
imprisonment to the Gaols at Bangalore
and Mysore.

I have &c

H. [illegible]
Home Secretary

List of enclosures.

29/3/09

Copied by
Examined by

C.R.D.
24.3.09

MGCPB—30,000—16-2-05